IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 0002

FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS FILED IN CLERKS OFFICE

2004 JAN -7 P 1: 53

ROBERT CAREY	AREY,	1	U.S. DISTRICT COURT CISTRICT OF MASS.		
Petitioner <u>Pro Se</u>	1		DISTRICT OF MASS.		
	T	a N			
v.		1	Case No.	~	
UNITED STATES	OF AMERICA,	1	Criminal	No. 99-40004-NM	IG
Respondent	Ι	-			
	I				
		I			
	000	010	000		

MOTION MADE PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 2255 TO VACATE, SET ASIDE AND OR CORRECT A SENTENCE MEMORANDUM OF LAW

COMES NOW the Defendant & Petitioner Robert Carey, <u>Pro Se</u>, in the above titled appeal of his criminal case, and Submits this Memorandum of Law in support of his Motion made pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255 to Vacate, Set Aside and or Correct his Sentence based upon the following facts and points of law:

I. FACTS OF THE CASE

It is noteworthy that Petitioenr's co-defendant,

Kimberly Powers, was a young female drug addict who lived in the
home of Petitioner in a meretricious relationship. Petitioner is
crippled and survived upon his Social Security Disability monthly
check and because of his physical infirmity was taken advantage of
by Ms. Powers who returned his kindness by fabricating numerous
drug sales as evidence of Petitioner's involvement in what was
essentially her own conspiracy to obtain drugs to support her habit.

Such explanation is necessary to understand why the Jury reached the Decision that they did, and also why they filled-out their "Special Verdict Forms" the way that they did. See Exhibit No. 1, Special VerdictForm for Jury's Deliberations with Composite Answers.

11. THE FIFTH AMENDMENT CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATION
TO "DUE PROCESS" BY CONVICTION IN VIOLATION OF
THE JURY'S SPECIAL VERDICT

The Jury found by its Special Verdict Forms which they filledout that Petitioner was <u>not</u> responsible for a "conspiracy described
herein involved 50 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing
a detectable amount of cocaine base..." Conviction and Sentencing
of Petitioner on Count One violates his Fifth Amendment "Due Process"
rights under the Constitution for Sentencing contrary to Jury's findings.

III. THE SIXTH AMENDMENT CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATION
AS TO INDICTMENT FOR AN OFFENSE WAS VIOLATED
BY CONVICTING AND SENTENCING PETITIONER IN
VIOLATION OF THE JURY'S SPECIAL VERDICT

Part II is hereby incorporated, and Petitioner alleges that
the conviction and Sentencing of Petitioner for being "involved
50 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing a detectable
amount of cocaine base" conspiracy when the Jury specifically found
that the concpiracy did not involve 50 grams or more in relationship
to the Petitioner's actions was a violation of his Sixth Amendment
Constitutional rights to be indicted upon what he was convicted
upon. Further, such conviction violates Federal Rule of Criminal
Procedure Rule 7 in permitting the indictment to be Amended by allowing
Petitioner's conviction for less than"50 grams or more of drug substance.

Count Five also upon which Petitioner was convicted had alleged a violation of 21 U.S.C. § 941(a)(1) and (b)(1)(B)(iii) in that the offense "involved 5 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing a detectable amount of cocaine base ..." The Jury convicted Petitioner upon that Count. See Exhibit No. 1, Page 6/6. However, that Offense was used to Sentence Petitioner based upon 43.38 grams of drug rather than the actual amount of 19.7 grams that was involved in that Count according to the trial testimony. However, under Apprendi, Id., since the Jury only found "at least five (5) grams" of drugs, but did not say specifically how much more than five grams they found, the maximum that Petitioner ought to have been able to be Sentenced upon was the Guideline Level that included amounts directly above U.S.S.G. Level with that amount. That Guideline Level is U.S.S.G. § 2D1.1(7) which is "At least 5 G but less than 20 G of Cocaine Base." That is Offense Level 26 rather than the Level 30 that was used to Sentence Petitioner. Based upon Petitioner;s Criminal History Category II, the Guideline Range was increased from a Range of "70-87" months to "108-135" months. Petitioner received a sentence of 108 months imprisonment.

Thus, both Count One and Count Five were increased from the quantities as alleged in the indictment to a greater level which was used to Sentence Petitioner upon his conviction for those counts. Both increases violated his Fifth Amendment "Due Process Rights" under F.R.Cr.P.7 and his Sixth Amendment rights to indictment.

IV. THE ERRORS OF DEFENSE AND APPEAL COUNSELS

DELINEATED IN PARTS II AND III REPRESENT

VIOLATIONS OF PETITIONER'S SIXTH

AMENDMENT CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO HAVE

"EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL" AT

BOTH THOSE STAGES OF HIS LEGAL PROCESS

The information and averments in Parts II and III are hereby incorporated, and Petitioner states that the failure of both his Sentencing defense counsel and his appeal counsel to raise those points of law and authority at both his Sentencing and upon appeal amount to a Sixth amendment Constitutional violation of his right to "effective assistance of counsel" at those stages of his legal process. See Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668, 80 L.Ed. 2d 674, 104 S.Ct. 2052 (1984).

Apprendi v. New Jersey, Id. had been constitutional law regarding the issues raised in Part II and III, and yet both counsel at Sentencing and appeal counsel did not raise what are obvious Apprendi-type issues. Petitioner was indigent and had no resources for paid counsel, and both counsels were appointed to represent him by the Courts. The failure to raise what is a watershed Supreme Court case regarding Sentencing and "relevant conduct" not found by a Jury "beyond a reasonable doubt" must result in Petitioner's Sentence being corrected to reflect the proper Sentnece based upon both the law and the Jury's findings. Petitioner ought to be Resentenced at no greater than Level 26, and to a Range of bettween 70-87 months and not his current 108 months. Justice demands no less.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Carey, Sr. Petitioner Pro Se

Federal Registry No. 80161-038

Housing Unit J-A Federal Medical Center Devens

P. O. Box 879

01432 Ayer, MA

DECLARATION MADE PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1746

I HEREBY DECLARE under penalty of perjury that the facts and information in the attached MOTION MADE PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 2255 TO VACATE. SET ASIDE AND OR CORRECT A SENTENCE & MEMORANDUM OF LAW is true and correct based upon my best information and belief.

January 2, 2004

Robert Carey, Sr., Declarant

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY under penalty of perjury that I have mailed an original and copys of the attached MOTION MADE PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 2255 TO VACATE, SET ASIDE AND CORRECT A SENTENCE and MEMORANDUM OF LAW in support thereof by first-class mail, postage pre-paid to the following persons:

> UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS WORCESTER DIVISION CLERK OF THE COURT U.S. COURTHOUSE 595 MAIN STREET WORCESTER, MA 01608

AND, placed same in the U.S. mails by handing same to an Institution Official for forwarding on January 2, 2003

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

United States of America v. Chamond Henderson and Robert C Defendants)))) arey,)	Criminal Action No. 99-40004-NMG
))	
VERI	DICT FORM	
WE, THE JURY, FIND THE DEFENDA	NTS:	
A. As to COUNT ONE and CHAMC with Intent to Distribute		
	Not Guilt	y Guilty
If you answer Question A "NOT If you answer Question A "GUIL		
A-1. Do you find that Chamond intent to distribute and to dis a mixture or substance contain base?	tribute at leas	t fifty (50) grams of
	No	Yes

** NOTE: This Exhibit is a part of the Document File and Record and is not a new addition to the Record. The Answers are the consensus answers of the Jury as a whole.

B. As to COUNT ONE and ROBERT Intent to Distribute and to		
<u> </u>	Not Guilty	∠ Guilty
If you answer Question B "NOT GUILTY"		
B-1. Do you find that Robert Carey to distribute and to distribute mixture or substance containing base?	at least fifty (50) grams of a
1	<u></u>	Yes
C. As to COUNT TWO and CHAMOND to Distribute and Distribut October 19, 1998)	<u>HENDERSON</u> (Possessio tion of Cocaine Base	n with Intent on or about
	Not Guilty	✓ Guilty
If you answer Question C "NOT GUILTY" 2:	ILTY", proceed to Questio	estion D. ns C-1 and C-
C-1. Do you find that Chamond He distribute and distributed on or five (5) grams of a mixture or samount of cocaine base?	about October 19, 1	1998 at least
	No	Yes
C-2. Do you find that Chamond Hence in Count Two within One Thousand comprising a public or private el school?	(1,000) feet of any	real property
	No	✓ Yes
2	2	

Intent to Distribute and about October 27, 1998 or	d Distribution of C	ocaine Base on or
	Not Guilty	Guilty
If you answer Question D "NO" If you answer Question D "GUI 2:		
D-1. Do you find that Chamon distribute and distributed or fifty (50) grams of a mixture amount of cocaine base?	d Henderson possess n or about October or substance contai	ed with intent to 27, 1998 at least ining a detectable
	No	Yes
D-2. Do you find that Chamond in Count Three within One property comprising a public secondary school?	Thousand (1,000) f	feet of any real
	No	Yes

E. As to COUNT FOUR and CHAMO to Distribute and Distri November 3, 1998 or Aidir	bution of Cod	caine Base on	or about
	Not Gui	ilty	, Guilty
If you answer Question E "NOT If you answer Question E "GUIL 2.			
E-1. Do you find that Chamond distribute and distributed on fifty (50) grams of a mixture amount of cocaine base?	or about Nov	ember 3, 1998	at least
	No		Yes
E-2. Do you find that Chamond H in Count Four within One Thousa comprising a public or private school?	and (1,000) fe	et of any real	property
	No		Yes

to Distribute and Distrib	<pre>DND HENDERSON (Possession with Intent bution of Cocaine Base on or about ing and Abetting such Possession)</pre>
	Not Guilty Guilty
	GUILTY", proceed to Question G. TY", proceed to Questions F-1 and F-
distribute and distributed on	Henderson possessed with intent to or about November 17, 1998 at least r substance containing a detectable
	NoYes
in Count Five within One Thousa	Menderson committed the crime charged and (1,000) feet of any real property elementary, vocational or secondary
	No Yes

Distribute and Distribution of Cocaine Base on or about November 17, 1998 or Aiding and Abetting Such Possession)
Not Guilty Guilty
If you answer Question G "NOT GUILTY", your deliberations are complete. If you answer Question G "GUILTY", proceed to Questions G-1 and G-2:
G-1. Do you find that Robert Carey possessed with intent to distribute and distributed on or about November 17, 1998 at least five (5) grams of a mixture or substance containing a detectable amount of cocaine base?
NoYes
G-2. Do you find that Robert Carey committed the crime charged in Count Five within One Thousand (1,000) feet of any real property comprising a public or private elementary, vocational or secondary school?
NoYes
Your deliberations are complete. Please notify the Marshal in writing.
FOREMAN: DATE: